

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:21 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Rezoning

From: Bob Ross s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:18 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Rezoning

Dear Mayor and Council;

Further to my previous email **opposing the Oakridge rezoning**, I have these two more comments to make **in opposition**.

- this project will not help our housing affordability problem. There are 2,914 residential units; 2,334 market strata condos, 290 market rentals, and 290 social housing units or less than 10%. The City includes 290 market rental units as affordable housing, but they will be rented out at market price - not lower, not subsidized - and therefore should not be considered part of the affordable housing package given the high cost of renting apartments in the Oakridge area.
- The densification of the Canada Line **is not "smart growth"**. The Canada Line is already packed during peak hours, and we don't have any new residents living in the new Cambie Corridor mid-rise buildings and towers yet, and there are 50+ towers between consideration and construction in Richmond around the stations and the Oval).

Respectfully,

Bob Ross

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:16 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Rezoning

From: Bob Ross s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 4:08 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Louie, Raymond; Reimer, Andrea; Tang, Tony; Carr, Adriane
Cc: City Manager (City Manager)
Subject: Oakridge Rezoning

I am **strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning** of the Oakridge site. I understand that a proper analysis of the traffic generated by this development proposal has not been done. This expansion creates huge implications for the Cambie corridor and the 41st Ave corridor. You must ensure that a competent traffic management plan is submitted and approved by The City Engineer before you approve this rezoning.

Sincerely,
Bob Ross

Subject: Fw: Oakridge Mall
From: Peter
To: mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca;
Date: Wednesday, December 31, 1969 4:00:00 PM

Mayor and council,

I am opposed to these massive hi-rise buildings.
Traffic will be 1 hour delays going to University of BC or to downtown.
Hamber and Van Horne schools are at capacity, there is no plan for a new school.
There is no more open space in the new mall. You can't see the sky.
It will be a total mess in the next 10 years. Noise and debris pollution for sure.

Peter

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 3:28 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Re development of Oakridge Centre 650 W 41st Ave

-----Original Message-----

From: Randy Kondo s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 3:18 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re development of Oakridge Centre 650 W 41st Ave

Dear Sirs,

As a born and bred Vancouverite, I am writing to express my concern about the mega development of Oakridge Centre and surrounding area. While Vancouver is a growing city and progress is inevitable, is it not in our collective best interest to maintain the residential character of some of our neighbourhoods?

Sincerely,
Randy Kondo

Sent from my iPhone

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Centre Mall rezoning application

From: Conor Douglas s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 3:13 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: janice douglas
Subject: Oakridge Centre Mall rezoning application

Dear Mayor and Council for the City of Vancouver,

my name is Conor Douglas, and I am a long-time resident of Vancouver (born and raised from 1979), and the Cambie corridor.

I am writing today with some concerns about the Oakridge Centre Mall rezoning application.

To begin, the proposed the fourth-floor green roof of the retail mall should not be considered park space. This is not appropriate place for child's play, and is not in accordance with the park space that has long been promised but never delivered in this area.

Further, the continued densification of this area is likely to be highly problematic based on the strain that local services (i.e. water, sewer, streets, the Canada Line, medical, public senior-care housing, emergency services, parks, recreation, daycare, and schools) are currently under.

Finally, this proposal will not help our housing affordability problem given that the 290 market rental units as affordable housing, but they will be rented out at market price - not lower, not subsidized - and therefore should not be considered part of the affordable housing package given the high cost of renting apartments in the Oakridge area.

I would strongly support a points-based system for rental apartments similar to that of Amsterdam. There, if a living space meets a certain set of criteria (based on points), then it can be rented to anyone for whatever the market will bare.

If, on the other hand, that space does not meet particular specifications (i.e. size, amenities, age, etc) then it is subject to a controlled rent that is set by the city. There residents put there names on a housing list once they are officially residing in the city, and are then eligible for the rent-controlled living spaces. The longer you are on the

list, the more places you have available to you.

Please slow down development in this area, plan for the massive growth you are proposing, and listen to the people who live in this area. Just because they are raising concerns does not necessarily make them NIMBY.

All the best, Conor Douglas

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 2:39 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Mall Redevelopment

-----Original Message-----

From: Irina s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 2:36 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Mall Redevelopment

Dear sir,

I want to express my deep concern about new proposed development at Oakridge Mall.

1. The number and especially HEIGHT of buildings are excessive. Additional 6,000 residents on the small piece of land, do we really need this kind of density? It will only create a lot of problems in this area with transportation, schools, medical care, traffic, fire department services etc.

Park on the roof of the building cannot be considered as a park, but part of the building.

2. It is not the only development planned along the Cambie Street, that will add to above problems.

3. You cannot allow people in this neighbourhood live near construction site for 10-15 years.

4. What have happened with the initial plan to construct 8-9 stories buildings? They will look much better next to 1-2 stories houses in private sector, and density will not be excessive.

5. Before allowing this development you have to consult and come to some understanding of the opinions and concerns of the neighbourhood.

I believe that before start all developments and changes along not only Cambie Street, but all over Vancouver, you have to look at the bigger picture, Great Vancouver, as it is already one city, not 5 different ones, and calculate and plan everything carefully for many years ahead (maybe 50 years plan). Let developers do what people need not what they want. There must be reasonable height limitation for new buildings. Let people discuss it together with city hall. Nobody wants monster's buildings in their neighbourhood and problems that it will create.

Please, listen to the people who elected you. Protect our interests.

Irina Jogova

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

姓名: LUCIA LIN

日期: MAR 20th 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶,

以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

在渥烈治商場重建計劃進展得如火如荼的這一刻, 請問市長和各位市議員們, 你們是否知道, 這計劃傷害和牽連到一座只有三層高內有三十二戶的居民(我們住在這裡的人, 平均年齡為75歲的老年人)。從發展商的推廣圖上看到自己住的樓房將夾在兩幢43和42的高樓中間, 再包圍在另外12座樓高為30-20-18層高的大廈, 建築工程歷時15-20年, 工程進行的日子, 天天嘈吵沙塵滾滾, 工程車來來去去, 的日子中渡日。

然後再生活在高樓的倒影中, 周圍再沒有景觀, 清新的涼風又被14座大樓擋住了。

我們竟然無辜的消失在這次重建的計劃中!!!

加拿大精神是人人平等, 不能讓財雄勢大的發展商犧牲了平民小百姓, 現在能申張正義和加拿大精神的人, 就要看市長和議員們了。

以下的幾項請謹重再考慮:

(一) 請將樓的高度降低到20層以下。

(二) 14座高樓減少至4座。

(三) 休閒嬉戲的公園要的是綠化空曠平坦的地面, 有清新的空氣, 綠草如茵, 老人家可休閒漫步, 小孩子可以玩耍就足夠, 所為甚麼亭台樓閣, 小橋流水, 只是用來裝飾好看而已, 反之

恐怕會令老人孩子造成意外! 簽名:

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

(四) 社區成人中心是重要, 但也不

要太忽略老人中心的設施! 謝謝!

姓名: A. C. Ser.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

日期: Mar 7, 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶

以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

親愛市長和議員:

將大弓區改建城市街道暫列 Amber St 路經
渥烈治商場如今擬建商場將對大居住
居民影響甚大為望市長和議員力保居民
免受食水污染等事為幸此致
敬禮

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Name: Anna Kwong

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

UAN

Date

3/6 2014

Mayor and Council,

我住在这个平静美丽的地方
已经多年. 很享受这个居住环
境, 不希望太多的发展和
大嘈杂的发展. 改变我们的
生活模式. 请尊重我们的
意见.

Yours sincerely,

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Signature

Name NORA

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address 

VANCOUVER B.C.

Date March 6 / 14

Mayor and Council,

我认为 oakridge mall 发展得
太过份, 例如, 象这样细小的地方
你们将它建成 14 座大厦, 还把
9 至 44 层的高度, 别人觉得
不太适合这样的发展, 希望你
们再重新考虑这个计划。

Yours sincerely,

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Signature 

姓名:

日期: Mar 6, 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶,

以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

各位官員們,

我很高興你們的意見是很快很快便改變。你們喜歡人多車多, 街上滿是行人, 等巴士站上不到巴士, 開車時停在街上走不通。只看見的就是一幢幢的商樓把整了無天和空氣清新優美的環境盡景破壞, 安居安業的生活完全消失。你們不知道你們那些官員們的心情怎樣, 只知道那些有財的商人把大部份的市民當作不知無知。請問閣下好良心, 知慧, 何在? 很是可惜又可怕。

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

姓名:

日期: MAR 6, 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是 s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential 的住戶，
以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

您的發展計劃本來相當不錯。依我所知，您們起初要發展 CAMBIE 臨時廣告，許諾們要把這塊地重建廿五層，把這塊地的居民都懼然之。您們官才又軟軟要重建45層。您們官才是否要做什麼便做什麼？市民的意見完全不理。

如此為何再要听取我們的意見呢？

我們相信那些商人要做什麼，您們官員都肯首肯，絕不再考慮大眾市民的生活和環境，又或者商人們對你們官員有任何好處！

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

(1) Personal and Confidential

JOHANNA HARR

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

姓名: 吳蓓蕾 BELLIE WOOD

日期: MAR. 6, 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶,

以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

- ① 用渥烈治商場作為 MUNICIPAL CENTRE 是不合理。
由北至南的中軸是由 DOWNTOWN 到 MARINE DRIVE. (是列治文)
由西至東的中軸是由 WEST END 到 BOUNDARY ROAD.
市政府的設計中心很明顯是為發展商而設。
- ② Oakridge 居民大多反對大樓高度, 公認最高樓層是 20 層。
而最後的 Policy Report, 大會及 COUNCIL 的結論竟與民衆
相反而行? 也沒有公開什麼樣的理據而出結果。
這是市府可關心對我們嗎。我看了市府的 118 頁
Policy Statement, 可明白的就是一份沒有理據但很
好的一份小說, 很很失望。(我不排除要看所有的
真實理據而不是汎汎之說)。
- ③ 市府明確知道 TERRACES 居民反對兩棟高樓在我
們旁邊, 為何如此支持持計劃商的說法, 可
否降低樓至 20 層和放在 High St 或 41st 街?
有必要令我們住得不舒服嗎? 況且 CAMBIE 和
49 街一樣是 Canada 經過之處, 地大也不繁忙,
為何一定要將已經繁忙的 41 街 ~~弄~~ 交通
弄得更繁忙???
- ⑤ TERRACE 居民已受盡噪音的騷擾, Canada Line 和
Crate of Banquet 的建造, 精神都變得憂屈, 為何不
改過 Terraces 居民???

請回應 in writing 給我

s. 22(1) Personal
and Confidential

22(1) Personal and
Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

姓名:

日期: March 5 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶,

以下是我對滙烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

- ① The proposed development will completely overwhelm the existing infrastructure in the west side of Vancouver.
- ② Twin towers in excess of 40 stories, together with other high rises will destroy the character of the city.
- ③ Tremendous hardship created for existing residents at the Terraces, many of them seniors. Their units will be in the shadows of the surrounding towers, resulting in much diminished natural light.
- ④ City hall has NOT been forth coming in sharing info. concerning this project.
- ⑤ City Hall MUST involve Vancouver residents in the surrounding neighborhoods, not just residents of the Terraces, because this project affects the entire city.
- ⑥ City Hall must change its modus operandi and heed the concerns of the residents.
- ⑦ City Hall must negotiate in good faith and not let developers like West Bank dictate agenda.

Your prompt attention / reply is appreciated

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

NAME: Vivian Lum
ADDRESS: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

DATE: November 11, 2013

RE: OAKRIDGE DEVELOPMENT & REZONING

TO: THE MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL

MY OPINIONS AS FOLLOWS:

MAXIMUM HEIGHT SHOULD BE RESTRICTED TO 20 FLOORS. THE SHADOWS RESULTING FROM THE HIGHER TOWERS IS TOO MUCH AND WILL BLOCK TOO MUCH SUNLIGHT FROM TOO MANY HOMES. INCREASING THE DENSITY AS CURRENTLY PLANNED WILL RESULT IN TOO MUCH TRAFFIC, HORNS, AMBULANCES AND NOISE. THIS MAKES PEOPLE VERY DISCOURTEOUS AND ANGRY.

TAKING TRANSIT IS NOT AN OPTION. IT IS ALREADY TOO FULL AND EXPANSION TO ACCOMMODATE ALL THE PEOPLE COMING TO LIVE ALONG THE CANADA LINE IS NOT POSSIBLE. LINE UPS FOR THE BUS ARE ALREADY TOO LONG AND PEOPLE ARE LEFT BEHIND. WHEN THE BUS LEAVES - IT IS TOO FULL.

THE PLANNED DENSITY WILL RESULT IN TOO MANY PEOPLE USING THE SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS, ROADS, TRANSIT AND OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES. WITHOUT ADEQUATE PLANNING.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

PLEASE REPLY IN WRITING TO ME.

姓名: Nancy Wai

日期: 3-5, 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶,

以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

高樓大廈太多!

1. 交通太亂

2. 人口太多

3. 綠地公園不足

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Name WAI CHAN LAI

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

VANCOUVER BC

Date MARCH 5, 2014

Mayor and Council,

IN 2007 THE RESIDENTS OF THE TERRACES
OBJECTED TO THE BUILDING HEIGHT OF 24 FLOORS
IN THAT PLAN, WE WANTED 17 OR 18 FLOORS MAX.
NOW YOU WANT US TO ACCEPT 44 FLOORS AND 14
NEW BUILDINGS. THIS IS TOO MUCH.
AT GRANVILLE & 57TH THE DEVELOPER WANTED TO
BUILD 19 FLOORS. WHEN PEOPLE OBJECTED, THE BUILDING
WAS REDUCED TO 16 FLOORS. WHY CAN YOU NOT REDUCE
THE HEIGHT OF THE OAKRIDGE BUILDINGS?

VANCOUVER IS IN AN EARTHQUAKE ZONE, IF AN
EARTHQUAKE OCCURS DURING CONSTRUCTION WE ARE
AFRAID THE BUILDING WILL FALL ON OUR LOWER
BUILDING & WE WILL HAVE NO PLACE TO GO. THAT
IS WHY WE INSIST ON A MAXIMUM OF 17 OR 18 FLOORS.
WE ARE ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT EMERGENCY ACCESS
FOR FIRE & AMBULANCE DURING CONSTRUCTION. ALSO,
FOR ANY DAMAGE WHICH OCCURS TO OUR BUILDING
FOUNDATION AS A RESULT OF THE CONSTRUCTION, WE WANT
Yours sincerely. THE DEVELOPER TO PAY FOR REPAIRS.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

姓名: Phibomena Choy

日期: March 4 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是 s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential 的住戶，
以下是我對滙烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

(反對) 在滙烈治商場發展計劃

每幢大廈不能超過 20 層。

請回覆。

姓名: SANDRA SONG

日期: MAR 4, 2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

的住戶,

以下是我對滙烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

反對在中街每層烈治

商場的複發展計劃。

每幢大廈最好不超過

20層。

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

多倫多城市政廳
辦事處
多倫多市居住
CARRIDGE LORRAINE AREA 附近居民

告知上述地段將興建
改建後將會大
影響附近居民之生活環境
目前該地政府
身之ORC及COOP
在繁化期間
對外交通
多繁慢
確使行人及車
輛環流
甚化
因該處位
議事執行者
多與考慮
或改建較底
層之屋宇
方便附近居民之生活環境
此致
草草

March 3 2014

請不要建太多高樓
在渥烈治區，交通
非常擁擠。

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Cecilia



姓名: LISA HUNG

日期: 3/5/2014

親愛的市長和議員們:

我是 [REDACTED] 的住戶，
以下是我對渥烈治商場發展計劃的意見:

1. 商場發展太快、太高、太大的計劃。

附近的人口都是住居區，將來影響

生活的品質一定受到很大的困擾。

A. 學校不週

B. 交通太亂

C. 治安問題

D. 讓我們有相當大的困擾

E. 聲音污染空氣

F. 主要的生活綠地公園不週

我 Liza Lam 本人强烈
反对 oakridge 扩展计划。
我在此地已居住几十年
喜欢维持这个宁静的社会
环境现状。保持社区的
安静与和谐。

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

March 6th 2014.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 2:30 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: "Development" Concerns.

From: Sergio Valdez s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 2:26 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: "Development" Concerns.

Hello City of Vancouver,

I am a person living on the Cambie Corridor and I am extremely concerned about the way you are dealing with the so called development you are have started in this area.

I would like to call out to your attention facts that I think you are not seeing since, well, you don't actually live here and don't have to deal with them.

I actually live in Marine Gardens, a small community of townhouses on the corner of Cambie and Marine Drive. This is a beautiful community full of trees that are hundreds of years old. The huge trees shade a big space where the kids, who are lucky enough to live here, actually go out and play any chance they get. Now, we are surrounded with construction and are threatened with the loss of this community. None of don't know what it's like living with the threat of eviction or live with constructions noises going off all hours of the day.

I don't know if you've imagined what it will be like when there are thousands of new families moving into this area. I am just talking about Cambie and Marine Dr. (where you are already building more than 4 towers and malls) but you should also take into consideration the 14 towers that are being planned in the Oakridge area, and whatever else you're wanting to build over the destroyed homes on the Cambie Corridor.

How many cars will this bring into the Cambie and Marine Dr area? It's bad enough as it is! Have you actually driven down here and taken a look around? Traffic is now a huge issue on Cambie Street and Marine Dr and you want to add thousands of more cars with all of the new homes you're wanting to build. Not only will new cars be a huge issue but the sky train will now not be sufficient to transport the amount of people that you hope will move into the new homes. The sky train peak hours around here are pretty bad, and with translink's new "innovative" gates, people flow really slowly through them and they are not even functioning yet!!

Have you had enough courage to come down and taken a look during peak hours? Maybe you'll notice that there are bus loads of people coming in from other areas in order to make to the train and the trains are pretty full since some are coming in from Richmond. It will be chaos here with the amount of people that will populate the area.

Along with more people where is the safety that they all need ? There aren't enough firehouses or police offices in the area for the people that live here now, and you're already building towers upon towers.

These are just a FEW of the issues that are obviously going to occur, but yet you give the blind eye to them.

The Marine Gardens community does not appreciate this planning that you're doing because of the GREED that runs this "development". You DON'T live here, you DON'T know what it's like. The trees that live in our community are amazing, they have taken years and years to get where they are now and you want to tear them down in seconds so that you get a chance at raising the real estate prices even more than they already are.

I really hope that you consider all of this and move to less populated areas in the lower mainland that need development and leave the communities that have actually built up over the years in peace. We will not leave with out a fight, and we invite you to take a look around the area so you actually notice what you are doing to it.
It's a really mad situation.

Thanks for your time.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:50 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge rezoning

From: Wendy s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:31 PM

To: Robertson, Gregor; Carr, Adriane; Ball, Elizabeth; Affleck, George; Tang, Tony; Reimer, Andrea; Meggs, Geoff; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Tim Stevenson; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office

Subject: Oakridge rezoning

gregor.robertson@vancouver.ca; adriane.carr@vancouver.ca; elizabeth.ball@vancouver.ca;
george.affleck@vancouver.ca; tony.tang@vancouver.ca; andrea.reimer@vancouver.ca;
geoff.meggs@vancouver.ca; heather.deal@vancouver.ca; kerry.jang@vancouver.ca;
raymond.louie@vancouver.ca; tim.stevenson@vancouver.ca; mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca
March 9, 2014

Mayor Robertson and Councillors
City of Vancouver
453 West 12 Avenue
Vancouver, B.C. V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor Robertson and Councillors,

I would like to ditto the remarks of Betty Murphy in her letter to you regarding the Oakridge rezoning

Re: Public Hearing - Oakridge Centre and Related Rezoning - March 10, 2014

The community has clearly stated that the development proposal is far in excess of what is appropriate for the site and many issues remain unresolved.

Some examples of unresolved issues are as follows:

- Only 10% of the costs of infrastructure and amenities to support a new development are typically covered by development fees of DCLs or CACs. The related costs for this development will be largely subsidized by tax payers and impacts of this has not been fully disclosed to the public.
- The impacts of this massive redevelopment do not appear to have been considered including on traffic and the increases to physical and social infrastructure that will be needed to support this redevelopment.
- The impacts on the Canada Line from this development have not been appropriately assessed, including how that would be paid for.
- The green roof of the retail mall that is the podium base for the 14 towers should not be considered the public park space that is required under policy.

- The massive development of 14 towers up to 44 storeys is entirely out of scale for this location and will have major impacts on shadowing of the surrounding community.

This project should not proceed as proposed.

Wendy Massing

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge development

From: Chambers, Tom (Vancouver, BC) s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:18 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Ballem, Penny; s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: Oakridge development

The Oakridge Centre mall rezoning application is premature as the impact on traffic and social infrastructure will be dramatically affected.

The mall proposal far exceeds the existing policy for the site. Public notification and consultation has been flawed.

The height of the proposed new towers are taller than the maximum of 24 storeys under the existing policy.

The 41st Avenue bus and Canada Line are already packed/crammed at peak times before any new occupancy from the proposed towers. The new ridership due to this development is already untenable and needs to be addressed. Adding in the thousands of residential units and saying no major improvements are needed on the Canada Line until 2045 makes no sense.

The city's 20% affordable housing target for this development will not be met as we full know that the market rental units that the developers are being given credit for will be rented at market rates for Oakridge-not lower, not subsidized rates.

The park issue, or more correctly, the lack of park issue- There is an agreement to have a minimum of 10% of the Oakridge mall site provided for park space, though the park dedication has been deferred, a fourth-floor green space on the mall and maintained by the mall owner and surrounded by condo towers, should not be considered as meeting that requirement. Accessibility and inclusiveness is an issue and the obligation to provide a park should translate to a real, at-grade park.

The densification of the Cambie Corridor and major projects will add tens of thousands of people. What additional services such as education, medical, police, fire & ambulance will be needed and how will they be paid for?

A study on Traffic and parking needs to be done. The neighborhood already has parking problems and with almost 7,000 parking stalls proposed, what are the traffic impacts and management strategies for both residents, workers and shoppers?

The 10-15 years of construction and disruption along with the demolition of the Bay, Zellers and Safeway will have an intolerable impact on residents. Much planning and input is needed and implications fully understood by all before rezoning is granted and I ask you to allow our city to grow in liveable and financially sustainable manner.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Tom Chambers,
s. 22(1) Personal and Con

Isfeld, Lori

From: balbir aulakh s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:32 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oakridge development

Hello

I am 72 year old. I haved lived in this area from last 29 year and shopped in Oakridge. I love my location. I have seen growth aroud Oak and cambie in last 29 years. But it was slow growth as well not too high. It did not disturb the living envoinment too much. Three langara aparments seems little out of place some times. But Now after seeing the Oakridge plan, that seems dawrf. What developer is proposing is, DownTown type of Aparments and Shopping in the middle of the City. It will make it, difficult for seniors. I will not be able to shop here too crowded for me. Under ground parking is security threat for me. Canada line is crowded even now. I can't imagine how crowded it will be after all the development on Cambie street. I hope You will consider our needs who are long time area residence of this area.

Thanks

Balblrs K. Aulakh
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:17 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Mall Rezoning

-----Original Message-----

From: Enrico Diano ^{5. 22(1) Personal and Confidential}
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:17 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Mall Rezoning

March 10, 2014

Via email to Mayor and Council of Vancouver

Re: Proposed rezoning of the Oakridge Shopping Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a resident of the City within a few blocks of the Shopping Centre and living with the traffic on Cambie. I have been a taxpayer for over 50 years and I must convey to you my recommendations in the hope that they will be considered.

The Oakridge Centre Mall rezoning application is premature and Mayor and Council should postpone any decision for a longer period of time to prepare a better plan and to call for a referendum of the immediate neighborhoods to participate in a democratic decision for rezoning.

Public notification and consultation are a total failure. It is my personal experience in the neighborhood that few people are aware of this mega project. I am even inclined to think that on purpose there has been a lack of consultation involving the neighborhood in a fair and responsible information process.

The implication and impact of this mega project will increase the need for physical and social infrastructure: streets, medical facilities, public senior-care housing, emergency services, parks, recreation, daycare, and schools. It is clear and evident that with these kind of projects we are consuming our limited infrastructure, thus reducing livability. These implications have not been thought through and much planning work and professional advice is needed before this rezoning is granted.

The "smart growth" terminology is an abuse. The Canada Line in fact we know is already packed during peak hours, and as yet we don't have any new residents living in the new Cambie Corridor mid-rise buildings and towers, and there are 50+ towers either under consideration or under construction in Richmond around the stations and the Oval. Expanding the Canada Line will require more funding from the entire region with more taxes and long term debt.

The claim of "affordability" is deceiving. And the pallid efforts to change the meaning are vain. The speculative waves created purposely to increase taxes are making of affordability a mockery.

This project is sold as a "regional project" to attract shoppers from all around the Greater Vancouver Area at the expense of the residents and taxpayers of our City. We should wait for the impact of the already approved zoning before we accumulate more needs for infrastructure increasing taxes and long term debts.

The mall proposal also far exceeds the existing policy for the site, Oakridge Centre Policy Statement 2007, and this is not acceptable to the residents and could even be illegal triggering more expenses from our taxes.

The fourth-floor green roof of the retail mall is not parkland and should not be called park space. That is an insult.

Please have the planning intelligently redone.

Sincerely

Enrico Diano

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:08 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge development

-----Original Message-----

From: Joe Wong s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:04 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Oakridge development

Dear Mayor and Council,

We think the development is good for Oakridge, however the height and density is really too much for Oakridge at this time. There are other factors we object to this development as of now, such as transportation to and from this area, schools, and other services. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joe and Sharon Wong.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: OAKRIDGE MALL REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

-----Original Message-----

From: Sergei Jogov s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:41 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: OAKRIDGE MALL REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

Dear Sirs,

My family has a serious concern about this proposal, with the possibility of adding 6,000 new residents to the area. We believe, it does not reflect the situation we have in the neighborhood in many respects, i.e.

1. Health care situation.

All medical facilities in the area are already full, starting with labs, and ending with VGH.

This is a well reported fact, and it cannot be overlooked.

2. Transit system.

Canada line at the rush hours is ALREADY overloaded, with the people packed like sardines, and there are about 50 towers under construction both in Vancouver - Marine Dr., and in Richmond, which will add to the congestion.

And we cannot agree with the mayor, when he calls it "a smart growth" in this respect.

Moreover, you regularly cannot take even the buses, due to they simply do not stop due to being overcrowded.

3. School and daycare facilities.

We expect to have children - grandchildren in the coming years, but the existing schools are already full, so how can the city start any new project of such a magnitude without looking into this problem?

4. It does not make sense at all to call rooftop greenspace "a park". We do not believe, the citizens should go to any legal body to find the definition of the park to talk to our elected officials.

We strongly believe, the city and its mayor should implement the earlier decision of the city to have 2.83 acre public park in the neighborhood.

I wonder, how the mayor and the council is going to make the city the greenest city in the world by not implementing the decisions, made earlier.

5. The area has all community services at this moment, which are quite convenient and sufficient, as we believe, to justify the construction of huge highrises by "taking care of this subject".

6. Earthquake factor.

The area is sitting on some kind of a body of water, and just recently there was a report, that the water can considerably magnify the effects of the quakes, so the question is, if the project was evaluated by such kind of specialists.

7. The process of considering the project looks flawed to us, it was sort of tried to be rushed through the system, which is a bad sign for us, and we strongly believe, it should be stopped, and get a very thorough inspection and evaluation by the professionals, including the legal side of it, as it violates the city's previous decisions about the height of the buildings, to be constructed in this area, the park etc.

The proposed construction, if not stopped, and reconsidered, can take

10-15 years of construction, which by itself can create a havoc and stress in the neighborhood, so it should be very carefully examined and evaluated, before the city takes a decision.

We believe, it is a direct responsibility of our elected officials to make our lives easier, or at least not to make them harder for us, and hope, there is enough wisdom, fairness and honesty in this council to take the right decision.

We have elected you to take care of our interests, and trust, you are fully able to do it.

Yours truly,

Jogov's family.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:54 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge re-development

-----Original Message-----

From: Graham s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:42 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge re-development

Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to formally voice my opposition to the proposed redevelopment of the Oakridge Mall in Vancouver. The proposed development is far larger, particularly in height, than is appropriate or necessary for this part of Vancouver. As a regular user of the Canada Line, I can speak to its already being at capacity. This development, along with others planned for the Cambie corridor will place added pressure to a system that is already at capacity.

Yours Truly,

Graham Abrahams

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: March 10 2014 Oakridge Rezoning Public Hearing

From: susan wu s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: March 10 2014 Oakridge Rezoning Public Hearing

To: Mayor and Council: mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca

Re: March 10 2014 Oakridge Rezoning Public Hearing

OPPOSE THE PROPOSED OAKRIDGE REZONING:

There are many reasons why my family members, my friends and I strongly oppose this proposed Oakridge Rezoning Application submitted today including the following:

- (1) AFFORDABILITY CRITERIA IS NOT MET,
- (2) SMART GROWTH CONCEPT IS TOTALLY QUESTIONABLE, AND
- (3) MOST TOWERS EXCEED THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 24 STOREYS AS SET IN THE OAKRIDGE CENTRE POLICY STATEMENT 2007.

The Oakridge Centre Mall rezoning application is premature and Mayor and Council must vote to DEFEAT it:

- the implications and impacts for this, the biggest development project that Vancouver has yet to embark on, have not been thought through and much planning work and professional advice is needed before this rezoning is granted. This includes traffic impact and the needed increases to physical and social infrastructure: water, sewer, streets, the Canada Line, medical, public senior-care housing, emergency services, parks, recreation, daycare, and schools
- the mall proposal far exceeds the existing policy for the site, **Oakridge Centre Policy Statement 2007**,
- the fourth-floor green roof of the retail mall should not be considered park space, public notification and consultation are critically flawed and cannot be relied upon, this project will not help our housing affordability problem. There are 2,914 residential units; 2,334 market strata condos, 290 market rentals, and 290 social housing units or less than 10%. The City includes 290 market rental units as affordable housing, but they will be rented out at market price - not lower, not subsidized - and therefore should not be considered part of the affordable housing package given the high cost of renting apartments in the Oakridge area.

- Mayor Robertson is incorrect when he calls the densification of the Canada Line "smart growth". His reason is the Canada Line (but we know it is already packed during peak hours, we don't have any new residents living in the new Cambie Corridor mid-rise buildings and towers yet, and there are 50+ towers between consideration and construction in Richmond around the stations and the Oval). The City's inclusionary housing policy for large development rezonings applies and sets a 20% affordable housing target for this development. The housing mix is 2,334 market strata condos, 290 social housing units, and 290 secured market rental units. The City is giving the developers affordable housing credit for the market rental units. This is inappropriate because these units will be rented at market rate - not lower, not subsidized - at whatever prices landlords can get for rent in the expensive Oakridge area.

Current proposal 14 new buildings from 9 - 44 storeys

- specifically: 9, 9, 13, 19, 20, 27, 31, 32, 34, 36, 36, 36, 41, and 44 storeys tall, approximately 6,000 new residents, 2,210 new retail jobs, 990 new office jobs,
- the majority of the proposed buildings are taller than the absolute **maximum of 24 storeys** under the existing policy for the mall site, the **Oakridge Centre Policy Statement 2007**

Susan Wu

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:52 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Comments re: Oakridge Redevelopment

From: Joanna Yang s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:37 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments re: Oakridge Redevelopment

Hello Mayor Robertson,

My name is Joanna Yang and I am a graduating Geography student studying at UBC. I met with Virginia Bird (Pottinger Bird) and Rhiannon Maberly (Westbank) two weeks ago about the Oakridge Redevelopment plan. As a young Vancouverite with plans to settle in the city, I would like to say that the plans to increase density in this neighbourhood appeals to me. I enjoy the idea that this development will cater to people that are environmentally conscious (ie: plans to sell units without parking spots to encourage taking public transit). Public amenities, access to shops and services, and green building practices are all elements that I value in my living space.

I understand that sometimes plans implemented with good intentions do not yield positive results. That being said, I would like to see the city commit to housing diversity and housing affordability. As a young Vancouverite and Canadian, I would like my community to be culturally, socially and economically diverse.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best,
Joanna

--
Joanna Yang

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:52 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: rezoning Oakridge

From: Wendy [REDACTED] s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Robertson, Gregor; Carr, Adriane; Ball, Elizabeth; Affleck, George; Tang, Tony; Reimer, Andrea; Meggs, Geoff; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Stevenson, Tim; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: rezoning Oakridge

Dear Mayor and Council,

I would like to ditto the remarks in the letter written to you by Jane Ingman-Baker

I am writing to oppose the rezoning of Oakridge under the proposal currently in front of you. This application is premature and that the matter is not ready for you to consider.

There are many problems with the proposed by-law, some of which are identified in the memorandum filed on March 7th by Mr Shillito, which proposes major changes to the buy-law appendices
[:http://former.vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/20140310/documents/phea3memo.pdf](http://former.vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/20140310/documents/phea3memo.pdf)

The fact that such changes are brought to your attention on the Friday before the public hearing should in be enough in and of itself for you to stand this matter down.

A careful read of this memoranda will alert you to the fact that there are problems with the security sought to guarantee performance, the development of a local energy system, groundwater protection and control, delivery and enforcement of the commitment to deliver a park area, delivery of the social housing units, viability of the commercial space requiring changes to permitted uses to include a university, and the ability of the Canada Line to support the increased riders. The last point is supported by Translink, who have expressed the view that station upgrades should be provided.

This rezoning will be the biggest development project that Vancouver has yet to embark on. It will redefine the Cambie corridor and will either be lauded or ridiculed. Whether it is the former of the latter is in your hands.

There has been a large amount of effort spent on the aesthetics of the

project. Huge sums have been spent on consultants to persuade you and others that the site can handle 14 towers and that children will frolic happily in an utopian park 6 storeys up in the air. However, there has been little serious work done on the key point. If you are to rezone this site for an additional 3000 plus residences and 1.8 million square ft of commercial space, how will the over 10,000 permeant users and the additional thousands of visors actually fit onto this site? How will they move on and off the site, how will they interact between themselves and with friends and family, what will they do when they are not shopping, and how will they impact and access educational, medical and sports facilities not provided on site?

The application itself is a mess. It takes hours to weave through the policy statement, draft by-law language, design guidelines, memoranda etc. If you can navigate through it, even more troubling is what is missing. NO environmental impact statement, NO transportation study (even the one filed with the original application is missing), NO current retail analysis (the old one uses old data and does not consider local impact), NO studies of off and onsite hourly movement by pedestrians, handicapped or cyclists, NO analysis of site safety, security and policing, NO local traffic plan, NO surface water management plan, NO siting for the local energy facility, NO analysis of how loading and unloading for the commercial facilities will interact with residential use, NO plan for outside areas for residents to use in the 15 years before the park is ready, and NO analysis of the impact that the increased residential and commercial use will have on off site daycare, preschools, education, sport or other facilities.

Another glaring omission is there is no analysis of the CAC?s to be received. There are lots of references to social housing, community facilities , parks etc, but nowhere in the material is there a breakdown of what profit will be made from the increased density and use and the corresponding portion that will be returned to the city. It is a quagmire of shifting sand with multiple examples of double counting and even the most supportive would be hard pressed to say that they are satisfied that the calculation has even been made. It reads as if the owner offered a series of shinny things which were cobbled together in desperation to improve the statistics for the term for this Council.

However, the most egregious error that is about to happen here is that a huge relocation of people is to be approved without an independent viable transportation analysis.

Until 10 days ago, all the documents relating to this site said that the owner would be responsible for station upgrades that would be needed to handle the increase demand on the Canada Line. Suddenly that is gone and \$600,000.00 for comfort improvements (maybe some seats and white paint for the lines through the project?) appears.

Mr Shilltos?s memo talks about the allocation of responsibility for Translink upgrades, and has a veiled reference to a Translink inquiry.

Readers are forced to conclude that the Owner has managed to duck out of this obligation and that the City will be left to try and pry funds for station upgrades from the Province. They in turn are bound to point out that this Council passed over the chance to get the property owner to do it.

I am not a transportation engineer but I do know that underground train capacity is determined in the main by two things. How frequently the trains come (a matter of computer science to optimize service without collisions) and how easily passengers can get on and off the station. In busy cities the trains come very frequently and urban stations have several entrances and exits allowing for efficient passenger movement. If you approve this plan as proposed, the opportunity to reserve space for new entrances or other improvements will be lost. The chance to connect the southern or western edges of the site to the station underground will be gone, or the place for a second escalator will be occupied by the footings for a tower. There are also some passing references in the application to moving the vehicle that current permits vehicles to exit the site onto 41st Avenue westbound. It may be necessary to move the tunnel if there is ever to be a westbound addition to the rapid transit system. This is the time to do a full analysis of this issue. What a tragedy it would be if nothing is done at this stage, and if the western route later becomes impossible because of the tunnel.

IF YOU MAKE NO OTHER CHANGES TO THIS APPLICATION, PLEASE DEMAND THAT AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE TRANSPORTATION ISSUES TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE THE BYLAW IS FINALIZED.

Sincerely

Jane Ingman Baker

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:25 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge development

From: Melody Mason s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:24 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge development

I urge the council to not support the Oakridge development. If it is allowed, it will set a dangerous precedent for other developments. The council is taking its densification policy too far and turning Vancouver into an ugly city that will look just like any other modern city. Surely the objective should be to make Vancouver the most livable city in the world and such ugly focal point developments will just make Vancouver a more alienated place to live.

To be more specific:

- this project will not help our housing affordability problem. There are 2,914 residential units; 2,334 market strata condos, 290 market rentals, and 290 social housing units or less than 10%. The City includes 290 market rental units as affordable housing, but they will be rented out at market price - not lower, not subsidized - and therefore should not be considered part of the affordable housing package given the high cost of renting apartments in the Oakridge area. The City is giving the developers affordable housing credit for the market rental units. This is inappropriate because these units will be rented at market rate - not lower, not subsidized - at whatever prices landlords can get for rent in the expensive Oakridge area.
- How will the Canada Line cope with the increase in passengers? It is already packed at peak hours. Where is Translink's commitment to expand the service to meet the needs of residents in the proposed tower blocks?
- the implications and impacts for this, the biggest development project that Vancouver has yet to embark on, have not been thought through and much planning work and professional advice is needed before this rezoning is granted. This includes traffic impact and the needed increases to physical and social infrastructure: water, sewer, streets, the Canada Line, medical, public senior-care housing, emergency services, parks, recreation, daycare, and schools
- the mall proposal far exceeds the existing policy for the site, **Oakridge Centre Policy Statement 2007**,
- the fourth-floor green roof of the retail mall should not be considered park space, and
- public notification and consultation are critically flawed and cannot be relied upon.

Regards,

Melody Mason

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:24 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Centre Mall Redevelopment Application- 650 West 41st Avenue - Feedback
Attachments: MC March 10 letter Oakridge.pdf
Importance: High

From: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:22 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Carr, Adriane; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Deal, Heather; Louie, Raymond; Jang, Kerry; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim; Tang, Tony
Subject: Oakridge Centre Mall Redevelopment Application- 650 West 41st Avenue - Feedback
Importance: High

Dear Mayor Robertson and City Councillors:

I am strongly opposed to the current Oakridge Centre Mall redevelopment plan proposal (650 West 41st Avenue). The plan should be rejected on several grounds. The Application does not support or respect the Oakridge Policy Statement 2007 and fails to meet criteria to exceed and amend the existing Policy. The Application and proposed plans fail to address significant concerns of both present resident locals who live in and around the development and Oakridge neighbourhood, and for the future residents and people it will attract.

I ask City Council to review my submission and move to reject the Applicant's latest draft plan. Please send this back to the Planners for further revision. I give the following feedback by email and attachment for your consideration, since I'm unable to attend this hearing today (*See attached document in .PDF format, 4 pages*). The attachment details my reasons and concerns regarding this Application.

Sincerely,

Madeline Cheng
Citizen & Resident
Vancouver, B.C.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Felicity Estrin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 12:10 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Oakridge Redevelopment

Dear Sir and members of the Council,

I voted for Vision in the last two elections, but concern has turned to alarm and now outrage at the rate at which Vision is allowing the city to be developed. The news of the latest Oakridge redevelopment, for me, is beyond the pale, and I'm consequently writing to council today. Vision Vancouver must stop the wanton, rampant destruction of our neighbourhoods; the fabric of our way of life is being destroyed as families are forced out, traffic congestion has reached the worst levels in North America, and we have become the second most expensive city in the world *ahead* of Paris, New York, and London. This must stop and immediately, before any more damage is done to what was once a live-able city.

We have been told repeatedly that densification "will happen" and somehow has to happen, yet where is the data (from studies not funded by interested parties) that supports this? The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods has shown that densification is happening at a far more rapid rate than is necessary based on even the city's own projections (<http://coalitionvan.org/media-releases/whats-the-rush-vancouver-communities-question-rapid-rate-of-development/>). Moreover, according to a study by UBC professor Andrew Yan, the equivalent of more than 35 condo towers are currently standing empty (<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/vancouver-vacancies-point-to-investors-not-residents/article10044403/>). Finally, reports suggest that the rate of newcomers to the city is dropping off due to unaffordability, so the city's own projections may never come to pass. The rapidity smacks of a cash grab on the part of the developers, who appear to own the Mayor and City Council, to "get while the getting is good."

This Oakridge redevelopment must be stopped, completely scrapped, as there is no way the surrounding neighbourhoods can absorb a sudden population influx of that magnitude without having their quality of life destroyed in the process. Moreover, Vision Vancouver must begin to demonstrate that there is genuine democratic process in this city (as opposed to fake community consultations). How about offering a referendum on your 30 year plan for the city?

Sincerely,

Felicity Estrin
Vancouver, BC

Isfeld, Lori

From: David Volkert s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Hearing 10 March 2014 - Oakridge Development

David F. Volkert

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential




The proposed Oakridge development has gone way beyond any reasonable community development. The proposed redevelopment of 2,914 residential units in 11 towers and 3 mid-rise buildings with a maximum tower height of 44 stories that will bring in approximately 6,000 new residents, not to mention a massive increase in shopper visits to the location will strain the Cambie and 41st Avenue traffic corridors, which are already a mess during rush hour and will simply become more so, as well as the now crowded Canada Line to downtown.

Reasonable development is warranted for any city and there is no question that the Cambie corridor is a good place for development. However, that development should be reasonable and should take into consideration all aspects and not further strain already full-capacity infrastructure.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

David F. Volkert

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential





Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:38 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Redevelopment

From: Larry Bengé s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:34 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Redevelopment

I am opposed to this rezoning proposal for the Oakridge Centre and Related Rezoning.

The consultation process leading up to this public hearing failed to take into account the voices of local residents i.e. those most directly impacted by this huge development. The Oakridge Langara Area Residents (OLAR) continues to be a strong voice of opposition to this project, indicating to me that the consultation process has been fundamentally flawed. This is a huge project that will impact the surrounding residents, businesses and transportation not to mention the impact on local schools and hospitals. Yet we see no impact studies on transportation in this document. This proposal contradicts city council's own directives from 2012 which determined maximum building heights well below what the developer currently proposes.

Generally, the community has clearly stated that the development proposal is far in excess of what is appropriate for the site and many issues remain unresolved.

Some examples of unresolved issues are as follows:

- Only 10% of the costs of infrastructure and amenities to support a new development are typically covered by development fees of DCLs or CACs. The related costs for this development will be largely subsidized by tax payers and impacts of this has not been fully disclosed to the public.
- The impacts of this massive redevelopment do not appear to have been considered including on traffic and the increases to physical and social infrastructure that will be needed to support this redevelopment.
- The impacts on the Canada Line from this development have not been appropriately assessed, including how that would be paid for.
- The green roof of the retail mall that is the podium base for the 14 towers should not be considered the public park space that is required under policy.
- The massive development of 14 towers up to 44 storeys is entirely out of scale for this location and will have major impacts on shadowing of the surrounding community.

This project should not proceed as proposed.

Sincerely,
Larry Bengé

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:34 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge development

-----Original Message-----

From: Phil Belanger s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:34 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge development

Hi ;

I would like to add my voice to those of many other concerned citizens - as a born and bred Vancouverite I feel that the development proposals for the Oakridge site are far too large in scope - especially with the current sub - par state of public transit (specific to that neighbourhood - no east / west subway) . We are in danger of " killing the goose that laid the golden egg" as Vancouver becomes more and more congested and a less pleasant place to live . Many people don't want Vancouver to end up like Hong Kong or Manhattan .

Spread out the density in other areas and make it on a more human scale - 44 stories is too tall for that or any other "low rise " neighbourhood . It would be a dangerous precedent to give the green light to this proposal in its current form

Yours truly ,

Phil Belanger
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:32 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Development

From: Colleen McGuinness [mailto:acmcg@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:18 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Reimer, Andrea; Affleck, George; Carr, Adriane; Tang, Tony
Subject: Oakridge Development

Dear Mayor Robertson and members of City Council

Today I write to support my neighbour Jane Ingmam's letter critiquing the Oakridge development report.

I do not have the knowledge to analyze the content of the report to the same depth as Jane, but after reading her letter to you I would be profoundly disappointed if a decision by this Council was based on a report with so many fundamental flaws. It is incomprehensible that this report was put forward by staff and that the public can find so many deficiencies that were overlooked or omitted.

I add my voice to those requesting that the decision of this Council regarding the Oakridge development be postponed until a report, with all the relevant supporting materials, is prepared.

Sincerely
Colleen McGuinness

Dear Mayor and Council,
Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to oppose the rezoning of Oakridge under the proposal currently in front of you. This application is premature and that the matter is not ready for you to consider.

There are many problems with the proposed by-law, some of which are identified in the memorandum filed on March 7th by Mr Shillito, which proposes major changes to the by-law

appendices : <http://former.vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/20140310/documents/phea3memo.pdf>.

The fact that such changes are brought to your attention on the Friday before the public hearing should in itself be enough for you to stand this matter down.

A careful read of this memorandum will alert you to the fact that there are problems with the security sought to guarantee performance, the development of a

local energy system, groundwater protection and control, delivery and enforcement of the commitment to deliver a park area, delivery of the social housing units, viability of the commercial space requiring changes to permitted uses to include a university, and the ability of the Canada Line to support the increased riders. The last point is supported by Translink, who have expressed the view that station upgrades should be provided.

This rezoning will be the biggest development project that Vancouver has yet to embark on. It will redefine the Cambie corridor and will either be lauded or ridiculed. Whether it is the former or the latter is in your hands.

There has been a large amount of effort spent on the aesthetics of the project. Huge sums have been spent on consultants to persuade you and others that the site can handle 14 towers and that children will frolic happily in an utopian park 6 storeys up in the air. However, there has been little serious work done on the key point. If you are to rezone this site for an additional 3000 plus residences and 1.8 million square ft of commercial space, how will the over 10,000 permeant users and the additional thousands of visors actually fit onto this site? How will they move on and off the site, how will they interact between themselves and with friends and family, what will they do when they are not shopping, and how will they impact and access educational, medical and sports facilities not provided on site?

The application itself is a mess. It takes hours to weave through the policy statement, draft by-law language, design guidelines, memoranda etc. If you can navigate through it, even more troubling is what is missing. NO environmental impact statement, NO transportation study (even the one filed with the original application is missing), NO current retail analysis (the old one uses old data and does not consider local impact), NO studies of off and onsite hourly movement by pedestrians, handicapped or cyclists, NO analysis of site safety, security and policing, NO local traffic plan, NO surface water management plan, NO siting for the local energy facility, NO analysis of how loading and unloading for the commercial facilities will interact with residential use, NO plan for outside areas for residents to use in the 15 years before the park is ready, and NO analysis of the impact that the increased residential and commercial use will have on off site daycare, preschools, education, sport or other facilities.

Another glaring omission is there is no analysis of the CAC's to be received. There are lots of references to social housing, community facilities, parks etc, but nowhere in the material is there a breakdown of what profit will be made from the increased density and use and the corresponding portion that will be returned to the city. It is a quagmire of shifting sand with multiple examples of double counting and even the most supportive would be hard pressed to say that they are satisfied that the calculation has even been made. It reads as if the owner offered a series of shinny things which were cobbled together in desperation to improve the statistics for the term for this Council.

However, the most egregious error that is about to happen here is that a huge relocation of people is to be approved without an independent viable transportation analysis.

Until 10 days ago, all the documents relating to this site said that the owner would be responsible for station upgrades that would be needed to handle the increase demand on the Canada Line. Suddenly that is gone and \$600,000.00 for comfort improvements (maybe some seats and white paint for the lines through the project?) appears.

Mr Shilltos's memo talks about the allocation of responsibility for Translink upgrades, and has a veiled reference to a Translink inquiry. Readers are forced to conclude that the Owner has managed to duck out of this obligation and that the City will be left to try and pry funds for station upgrades from the Province. They in turn are bound to point out that this Council passed over the chance to get the property owner to do it.

I am not a transportation engineer but I do know that underground train capacity is determined in the main by two things. How frequently the trains come (a matter of computer science to optimize service without collisions) and how easily passengers can get on and off the station. In busy cities the trains come very frequently and urban stations have several entrances and exits allowing for efficient passenger movement. If you approve this plan as proposed, the opportunity to reserve space for new entrances or other improvements will be lost. The chance to connect the southern or western edges of the site to the station underground will be gone, or the place for a second escalator will be occupied by the footings for a tower. There are also some passing references in the application to moving the vehicle that current permits vehicles to exit the site onto 41st Avenue westbound. It may be necessary to move the tunnel if there is ever to be a westbound addition to the rapid transit system. This is the time to do a full analysis of this issue. What a tragedy it would be if nothing is done at this stage, and if the western route later becomes impossible because of the tunnel.

IF YOU MAKE NO OTHER CHANGES TO THIS APPLICATION, PLEASE DEMAND THAT AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF THE TRANSPORTATION ISSUES TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE THE BYLAW IS FINALIZED.

I have chosen to focus above on the global problems this application presents, but since I own property immediately adjacent to the site, I must also add that there are many issues with the location and use of New Street and traffic flow to the immediate west of the site. My family have owned the duplex on the corner of 42nd and Willow for over 40 years. Every day children move through the intersection to access King David School, the French immersion school, and the JCC. Generally the area is busy with pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The idea that traffic calming measures will be instigated 5 years after the last occupancy permit is issued is a dereliction of your duty to this community. The safety of local residents and children should be a primary concern and that cannot be abandoned during two decades of construction. I thus ask that no development permit be issued without a local traffic management plan for each and every phase of development.

Sincerely

Jane Ingman Baker

Chair Dunbar Vision Implementation Committee and concerned local property owner.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:29 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Re-development Plan

From: Barry Truter s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:02 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Re-development Plan

To: The Mayor and Councillors, Vancouver City Council

RE: Oakridge Centre Re-development pLAN

I am a resident of the Vancouver living in the vicinity of Oakridge Centre. I would like to register my strong concern with the proposed Oakridge Centre Re-development Plan.

In my opinion the plan has many flaws. Here are my biggest concerns:

- The height of the proposed residential towers has been increased to 30 and 40 storey buildings. This is in some cases double the height restrictions laid out in the 2007 Oakridge Policy/Plan, and is incompatible with the height of existing buildings in the area, e.g., Langara Gardens at 22 stories.
- The residents of the area have been promised a ground level park since 1983. The City has never delivered. The proposed roof-top green space is no substitute for a ground level park.
- Rush hour traffic is already chaotic at the 41st and Cambie crossroads and will become more so given the estimated 6,000 new residents expected to be housed in the area, and the increase in shopper visits as a result of the proposed doubling of retail space.
- Market rental housing is not affordable housing. With this new plan, the City will be breaking its guidelines of 20% allocation of units for social and affordable housing.

I am not opposed to re-development of the Oakridge Centre. I am simply appalled at the scale of the current proposal. It is completely at odds with the City's often expressed desire to create a green, livable environment for all.

I would request that you do the following:

1. Please send the current proposal back to the drawing board using the 2007 Policy/Plan as a baseline.

2. Please direct the City planning department to reduce tower heights, deliver long standing promises of a ground level park, address traffic concerns, and stand by the policy of 20% allocation of units for social and truly affordable housing.

3. Please provide for a much fuller and broader consultation with the public on the new plan than has happened to date.

Thank you for your consideration.

Barry Truter

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

A large grey rectangular redaction box covers the text below the signature.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:30 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Proposed Oakridge Development

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Patrick Caraher
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:07 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Proposed Oakridge Development

I urge the mayor and council to either outright reject the proposed development, or ask for a much scaled down version of same. Vancouver and the Lower Mainland's reckless growth strategy is neither sustainable, liveable, nor green. To paraphrase David Suzuki... growth does not necessarily equal progress. The main "progress" to be seen if this proposal comes to fruition will be the upward progression of the developer's bank account and corporate election donations...

P. Caraher
Vancouver

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:30 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Mall

From: Peter Poon s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 11:08 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Fw: Oakridge Mall

Mayor and council,

I am opposed to these massive hi-rise buildings.
Traffic will be 1 hour delays going to University of BC or to downtown.
Hamber and Van Horne schools are at capacity, there is no plan for a new school.
There is no more open space in the new mall. You can't see the sky.
It will be a total mess in the next 10 years. Noise and debris pollution for sure.

Peter

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge mall redevelopment problematical

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Carole Anne Soong
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 10:44 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge mall redevelopment problematical

Dear Mayor and Council Members

As a longtime resident of the Cambie Corridor and Oakridge Mall area I cannot understand why you are reviewing this present redevelopment plan when there is an existing 2007 Oakridge Centre policy statement which should guide any changes to the Mall site. Has Council rescinded that Policy statement? A maximum height of 24 storey buildings was in the Policy yet now being considered are heights of 44 stories for buildings on the site which will overshadow surrounding neighbours and neighbourhoods. There is a covenant on the Oakridge Mall for a 2.8acre park (not green space 4 stories above ground), we expect the Mall owner/developer to comply with the covenant.

There has as well been insufficient consideration given to the great impact of this very large development and increased population on the social infrastructure (especially school space) and transportation(Canadialine capacity?)and traffic.

I believe that Council should refer to the 2007 Oakridge Centre policy statement for guidance in redevelopment on the site. What is in front of you today is not acceptable in so many ways as stated over and over again by other fellow citizens.

Sincerely,
Carole Anne Soong

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 10:13 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Stop the Cancerous Redevelopment of Oakridge

From: BonVoyage s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 10:12 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: Stop the Cancerous Redevelopment of Oakridge

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

I do not live in the Oakridge area, but I am horrified by the unbridled redevelopment at Oakridge- the crown jewel of westside shopping in Vancouver! I do not want to see another monstrous Metrotown erected in the heart of Vancouver Westside. In fact the Cambie Corridor and Marpole already have their more than fair share of rezoning/development. We all love Vancouver for what it is thanks to the vision and wisdom of our forefathers! The proposed Oakridge redevelopment plan, along with other plans in the rest of the city, will ruin our beautiful city once for all. You have the power to stop this insane redevelopment presumably fuelled by some offshore or recent immigrant investors with deep pockets. Don't be pushed, swindled and tentalized by them. Overzealous rezoning will cost us all for the quality of life we and our children enjoy. History making decisions are in your hand, and the whole city are watching...

Stop this insane redevelopment in Oakridge!

Thank you.

Andy Qu

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential